

QUEEN VICTORIA'S CROWN.  
An estimate of the value of the  
diamonds in the Queen's crown.  
The crown is set with 1,368  
diamonds, 22,000 each.  
The diamonds placed at the  
base of the crown are 1,000  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

On the top of the crown 40,000  
diamonds, each valued at 10,000.  
The diamonds set in the  
crown are 1,368  
each composed of twenty-five  
diamonds.

# MASSACHUSETTS WEEKLY

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, FOR THE BENEFIT OF FARMERS AND MECHANICS, AT QUINCY HALL, SOUTH MARKET STREET—WM. BUCKMINSTER, OF FRAMINGHAM, EDITOR.

BOSTON, SATURDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 13, 1847.

**PUBLISHED BY**  
**WILLIAM BUCKMINSTER,**  
AND  
**WILLIAM J. BUCKMINSTER.**  
TERMS, \$2.00 in advance—if payment is delayed  
after six months \$2.50 will be charged.  
Papers not discontinued without a personal or  
written notice from the subscriber or postmaster,  
and postage paid.  
No paper sent for a term less than six months.  
All correspondence should be addressed to the  
Editor at Boston.  
Advertising on reasonable terms.

**Governor Hill, of N. H. upon Lime in Agriculture.**

The Governor, in his Monthly Visitor of October 21st, devotes three or four columns of his paper to a notice of the lime industry in New Hampshire. He speaks of the lime industry in New Hampshire as being one of the principal sources of wealth in that State. He speaks of the lime industry in New Hampshire as being one of the principal sources of wealth in that State. He speaks of the lime industry in New Hampshire as being one of the principal sources of wealth in that State.

**Correspondence.**

**DIGNITY OF FARMING—ORTHOGRAHY—ANCIENT ROMANS.**

MR. EDITOR.—Sir: There appears to me a great want of self-respect among our farmers; they undervalue their profession and do not consider the paramount importance of the occupation of a husbandman to their country and the world.

Many of our young gentlemen of enterprise who have a laudable ambition to be useful, consider the science of agriculture confined to a certain routine of practice which requires but little thought and a few years to arrive at a perfect knowledge of all its mysteries; they of course choose some other sphere of action, a mechanical or mercantile situation, or perhaps one of the learned professions. I consider a great evil; and I am sure, the common necessity of a husbandman to his country and the world, is a great evil; and I am sure, the common necessity of a husbandman to his country and the world, is a great evil.

As to his insinuations respecting the imperfection of ancient husbandry, I cannot so easily pass them, for these have a direct tendency to defeat the main object of my communication. The gentleman of Penobscot, if I understand him rightly, would have us infer, first, that the implements used by them were of clumsy construction; and secondly, that their husbandry must as a consequence be performed in an imperfect manner. To prove the first, he brings forward the plow, and the good man felt highly gratified at the notice taken of it by many of our readers. But, in less than five years the wall exhibited a deplorable dilapidation. The good man felt highly gratified at the notice taken of it by many of our readers. But, in less than five years the wall exhibited a deplorable dilapidation.

Not long since I saw a discussion on the manner of spelling plough, some contending that it ought to be *plow*, and I have yet to learn the correct spelling of this useful implement. Now there is as much difference in these two ways as between the ancient and modern methods.

In the first and most flourishing years of the republic of Rome, seven acres of land was all that was allowed to one husbandman and his family; so well was it cultivated that all kinds of grain and produce of the soil were abundant; and the soil was a rich and fertile one.

This was not done in a corner, and the Governor knew of it at the time, for he copied into his paper the proceedings of these meetings, and gave one of the lectures that we had there.

In another place the Governor is incorrect in point of fact. He understands that one of the positions of the Ploughman is, "that lime fails to hasten the decomposition of organic matter." He then goes on to show that lime, when he first tried a few fresh casks of his dung heap, "was a little too heavy in action" (that is he actually burnt up a pile of stable manure by slaking a few casks of lime in it).

This must have been committed as much as eight or nine years ago, when the Governor first commenced farming. For every farmer's boy well knows that lime should never be slaked in a heap of "vegetable and animal manure." Boys roast corn and potatoes in a bed of lime by the heat that is developed in the process of slaking. Boys all know that manure will burn in such an oven.

Yet our readers believe, the Governor cites this as one of his (this is slaking lime in a dung pile) to prove the error of the Ploughman's doctrine that lime fails to hasten the decomposition of organic matter.

Governor Hill has read enough to know that the English and all other writers use old, English, spent lime on their lands, many contending that new lime produces but little effect the first year; Gov. Hill himself in this very criticism contending that lime must not be expected to operate to the immediate advantage of the farmer—that its good effects are seen for years. But now, to upset our orthodoxy, he speaks of the operation of lime while it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

We hope we are now understood. Slaked lime, as used by farmers, has no tendency to promote the rotting of vegetable matter. All the writers that we have heard of till now have treated of slaked lime when contending in favor of its promoting the decomposition of matter.

The important question for farmers is not whether lime ought to behave better when it is fondled so much; but whether, in fact, it is needed here in greater quantities than it is found in our fields. We want direct and positive evidence in its favor. All reasoning on the component parts of grain &c. fails unless it can be plainly shown that an addition of lime to that which now exists in the soil produces better crops.

And here most of our farmers are agreed. Mr. Colman himself, once a strenuous devotee to lime, declared to us in State street that in his official tour of the western counties he could not find one farmer in a hundred who would admit that lime had been of service to his land.

Gov. Hill too must see, as he has read the Ploughman, that lime has no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter when it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

We hope we are now understood. Slaked lime, as used by farmers, has no tendency to promote the rotting of vegetable matter. All the writers that we have heard of till now have treated of slaked lime when contending in favor of its promoting the decomposition of matter.

The important question for farmers is not whether lime ought to behave better when it is fondled so much; but whether, in fact, it is needed here in greater quantities than it is found in our fields. We want direct and positive evidence in its favor. All reasoning on the component parts of grain &c. fails unless it can be plainly shown that an addition of lime to that which now exists in the soil produces better crops.

And here most of our farmers are agreed. Mr. Colman himself, once a strenuous devotee to lime, declared to us in State street that in his official tour of the western counties he could not find one farmer in a hundred who would admit that lime had been of service to his land.

Gov. Hill too must see, as he has read the Ploughman, that lime has no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter when it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

We hope we are now understood. Slaked lime, as used by farmers, has no tendency to promote the rotting of vegetable matter. All the writers that we have heard of till now have treated of slaked lime when contending in favor of its promoting the decomposition of matter.

The important question for farmers is not whether lime ought to behave better when it is fondled so much; but whether, in fact, it is needed here in greater quantities than it is found in our fields. We want direct and positive evidence in its favor. All reasoning on the component parts of grain &c. fails unless it can be plainly shown that an addition of lime to that which now exists in the soil produces better crops.

And here most of our farmers are agreed. Mr. Colman himself, once a strenuous devotee to lime, declared to us in State street that in his official tour of the western counties he could not find one farmer in a hundred who would admit that lime had been of service to his land.

Gov. Hill too must see, as he has read the Ploughman, that lime has no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter when it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

We hope we are now understood. Slaked lime, as used by farmers, has no tendency to promote the rotting of vegetable matter. All the writers that we have heard of till now have treated of slaked lime when contending in favor of its promoting the decomposition of matter.

The important question for farmers is not whether lime ought to behave better when it is fondled so much; but whether, in fact, it is needed here in greater quantities than it is found in our fields. We want direct and positive evidence in its favor. All reasoning on the component parts of grain &c. fails unless it can be plainly shown that an addition of lime to that which now exists in the soil produces better crops.

And here most of our farmers are agreed. Mr. Colman himself, once a strenuous devotee to lime, declared to us in State street that in his official tour of the western counties he could not find one farmer in a hundred who would admit that lime had been of service to his land.

Gov. Hill too must see, as he has read the Ploughman, that lime has no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter when it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

man, according to his own statement, for many years and has been much to admire in it; that a host of our correspondents veto line in the strongest terms. Now what is the use of our friend's treating the ground that we are "prejudiced" and "hostile" to lime? We have often tried lime to our hurt, not because lime hurt the soil, but because it wasted our money. Our gubernatorial friends insist that we are "unfair" in comparing lime with sand as an ingredient to be added to the soil, for all know that sand is an essential ingredient in all soils. He seems to think that sand should not be compared with lime because sand is a common and cheap article. This is the very reason why farmers prefer it.

If an addition of sand, or clay, or gravel proves more beneficial to any soil than an addition of lime, why not recommend either of them in preference to lime? Facts are all that is wanted to decide this question, and we are at a loss to conceive why any one who demands facts in order to win his assent should be accused of unfairness.

**Correspondence.**

**DIGNITY OF FARMING—ORTHOGRAHY—ANCIENT ROMANS.**

MR. EDITOR.—Sir: There appears to me a great want of self-respect among our farmers; they undervalue their profession and do not consider the paramount importance of the occupation of a husbandman to their country and the world.

Many of our young gentlemen of enterprise who have a laudable ambition to be useful, consider the science of agriculture confined to a certain routine of practice which requires but little thought and a few years to arrive at a perfect knowledge of all its mysteries; they of course choose some other sphere of action, a mechanical or mercantile situation, or perhaps one of the learned professions. I consider a great evil; and I am sure, the common necessity of a husbandman to his country and the world, is a great evil; and I am sure, the common necessity of a husbandman to his country and the world, is a great evil.

As to his insinuations respecting the imperfection of ancient husbandry, I cannot so easily pass them, for these have a direct tendency to defeat the main object of my communication. The gentleman of Penobscot, if I understand him rightly, would have us infer, first, that the implements used by them were of clumsy construction; and secondly, that their husbandry must as a consequence be performed in an imperfect manner. To prove the first, he brings forward the plow, and the good man felt highly gratified at the notice taken of it by many of our readers. But, in less than five years the wall exhibited a deplorable dilapidation. The good man felt highly gratified at the notice taken of it by many of our readers. But, in less than five years the wall exhibited a deplorable dilapidation.

Not long since I saw a discussion on the manner of spelling plough, some contending that it ought to be *plow*, and I have yet to learn the correct spelling of this useful implement. Now there is as much difference in these two ways as between the ancient and modern methods.

In the first and most flourishing years of the republic of Rome, seven acres of land was all that was allowed to one husbandman and his family; so well was it cultivated that all kinds of grain and produce of the soil were abundant; and the soil was a rich and fertile one.

This was not done in a corner, and the Governor knew of it at the time, for he copied into his paper the proceedings of these meetings, and gave one of the lectures that we had there.

In another place the Governor is incorrect in point of fact. He understands that one of the positions of the Ploughman is, "that lime fails to hasten the decomposition of organic matter." He then goes on to show that lime, when he first tried a few fresh casks of his dung heap, "was a little too heavy in action" (that is he actually burnt up a pile of stable manure by slaking a few casks of lime in it).

This must have been committed as much as eight or nine years ago, when the Governor first commenced farming. For every farmer's boy well knows that lime should never be slaked in a heap of "vegetable and animal manure." Boys roast corn and potatoes in a bed of lime by the heat that is developed in the process of slaking. Boys all know that manure will burn in such an oven.

Yet our readers believe, the Governor cites this as one of his (this is slaking lime in a dung pile) to prove the error of the Ploughman's doctrine that lime fails to hasten the decomposition of organic matter.

Governor Hill has read enough to know that the English and all other writers use old, English, spent lime on their lands, many contending that new lime produces but little effect the first year; Gov. Hill himself in this very criticism contending that lime must not be expected to operate to the immediate advantage of the farmer—that its good effects are seen for years. But now, to upset our orthodoxy, he speaks of the operation of lime while it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

We hope we are now understood. Slaked lime, as used by farmers, has no tendency to promote the rotting of vegetable matter. All the writers that we have heard of till now have treated of slaked lime when contending in favor of its promoting the decomposition of matter.

The important question for farmers is not whether lime ought to behave better when it is fondled so much; but whether, in fact, it is needed here in greater quantities than it is found in our fields. We want direct and positive evidence in its favor. All reasoning on the component parts of grain &c. fails unless it can be plainly shown that an addition of lime to that which now exists in the soil produces better crops.

And here most of our farmers are agreed. Mr. Colman himself, once a strenuous devotee to lime, declared to us in State street that in his official tour of the western counties he could not find one farmer in a hundred who would admit that lime had been of service to his land.

Gov. Hill too must see, as he has read the Ploughman, that lime has no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter when it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

We hope we are now understood. Slaked lime, as used by farmers, has no tendency to promote the rotting of vegetable matter. All the writers that we have heard of till now have treated of slaked lime when contending in favor of its promoting the decomposition of matter.

The important question for farmers is not whether lime ought to behave better when it is fondled so much; but whether, in fact, it is needed here in greater quantities than it is found in our fields. We want direct and positive evidence in its favor. All reasoning on the component parts of grain &c. fails unless it can be plainly shown that an addition of lime to that which now exists in the soil produces better crops.

And here most of our farmers are agreed. Mr. Colman himself, once a strenuous devotee to lime, declared to us in State street that in his official tour of the western counties he could not find one farmer in a hundred who would admit that lime had been of service to his land.

Gov. Hill too must see, as he has read the Ploughman, that lime has no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter when it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

We hope we are now understood. Slaked lime, as used by farmers, has no tendency to promote the rotting of vegetable matter. All the writers that we have heard of till now have treated of slaked lime when contending in favor of its promoting the decomposition of matter.

The important question for farmers is not whether lime ought to behave better when it is fondled so much; but whether, in fact, it is needed here in greater quantities than it is found in our fields. We want direct and positive evidence in its favor. All reasoning on the component parts of grain &c. fails unless it can be plainly shown that an addition of lime to that which now exists in the soil produces better crops.

And here most of our farmers are agreed. Mr. Colman himself, once a strenuous devotee to lime, declared to us in State street that in his official tour of the western counties he could not find one farmer in a hundred who would admit that lime had been of service to his land.

Gov. Hill too must see, as he has read the Ploughman, that lime has no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter when it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

We hope we are now understood. Slaked lime, as used by farmers, has no tendency to promote the rotting of vegetable matter. All the writers that we have heard of till now have treated of slaked lime when contending in favor of its promoting the decomposition of matter.

The important question for farmers is not whether lime ought to behave better when it is fondled so much; but whether, in fact, it is needed here in greater quantities than it is found in our fields. We want direct and positive evidence in its favor. All reasoning on the component parts of grain &c. fails unless it can be plainly shown that an addition of lime to that which now exists in the soil produces better crops.

And here most of our farmers are agreed. Mr. Colman himself, once a strenuous devotee to lime, declared to us in State street that in his official tour of the western counties he could not find one farmer in a hundred who would admit that lime had been of service to his land.

Gov. Hill too must see, as he has read the Ploughman, that lime has no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter when it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

We hope we are now understood. Slaked lime, as used by farmers, has no tendency to promote the rotting of vegetable matter. All the writers that we have heard of till now have treated of slaked lime when contending in favor of its promoting the decomposition of matter.

The important question for farmers is not whether lime ought to behave better when it is fondled so much; but whether, in fact, it is needed here in greater quantities than it is found in our fields. We want direct and positive evidence in its favor. All reasoning on the component parts of grain &c. fails unless it can be plainly shown that an addition of lime to that which now exists in the soil produces better crops.

And here most of our farmers are agreed. Mr. Colman himself, once a strenuous devotee to lime, declared to us in State street that in his official tour of the western counties he could not find one farmer in a hundred who would admit that lime had been of service to his land.

Gov. Hill too must see, as he has read the Ploughman, that lime has no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter when it is slaking!

Our readers will know that when we have contended that lime had no effect to hasten the rotting of vegetable matter we spoke of lime as it is usually applied. We have quite often admitted that while it was slaking it would generate heat, and thus aid in the promotion of decomposition. But no man of any experience would ever put unslaked lime in a manure heap, or into any heap that had combustible matter in it.

Will not most people object to the writing of no far house of file for fight—of mile for might—of ruf for rough—of cot for cough—of luf for laugh? And so of a thousand other words that might be named and might be corrected.

It is not an easy matter to change the orthography of a language, and no writer can do it. The celebrated and learned Noah Webster tried it long and obstinately. He published books with his new spelling, but he was forced to back out at last, and to admit that if there was any *deposition* in the republic of letters, it is a *deposition* of the many and not of one. [Editor.]

**Butter from One Cow.**

MR. EDITOR.—Dear Sir, In reading your paper I notice occasionally an article in relation to milk cows, and the quantity of butter made in a certain number of days. Thinking I could tell as good a story as any by my pen, I thought I would give you the particulars. You could give them a place in your valuable paper.

My father, S. Peckham, has kept one cow, and one two years older heifer this season, and one yearling heifer. Peckham set the milk separator and churned each by itself, and from the milk of the cow she made ten pounds of butter in seven days; and from the milk of the two years old heifer she made seven and a half pounds of butter in seven days, and she was milking at all and some new milk was used in the family in the time, but how much I cannot say, probably not much—the milk was not weighed.

Yours respectfully,  
JAMES M. PECKHAM.

**Hamden County Agricultural Fair.**











